(MR. SPEAKER)

(4) Communication dated 31st December 1964 from the Superintendent of Police, South Kanara, Mangalore, regarding arrest of Sri A. Krishna Shetty and it reads as follows :

" Sri A. Krishna Shetty, Member, Legislative Assembly of Mangalore, was arrested at 6-45 P.M. on 30th instant at Vorkady in Kerala as per detention order and rule 30 of D.I R. 1962 issued by the Deputy Commissioner, outh Kanara on 29th. He is being sent to Mangalore Sub-Jail for detention."

Leave of Absence—Grant of :

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received a letter from Sri Angadi Channabasappa, a Member of the Assembly, requesting for leave of absence from attending current sitting of the Assembly due to ill-health of his daughter.

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Sri Angadi Channabasappa, from attending current sitting of the Assembly?

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Permission to remain absent is granted.

Members' Representations

Sri R. M. PATIL (Minister for Home).—I have got to raise a point of order. The point of order is this. Certain Hon'ble Members interrupted the proceedings and business of the House and staged a walk out at the time the Governor was pleased to address this House. The point of order is a constitutional point. I, therefore, bring this to the notice of this august House including the Speaker and in addition to this I have moved a privilege motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Home Minister has only given notice of a privilege motion only.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—We want to know what the point of order is.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am trying to exert myself against the medical advice. I will give the Hon'ble Member the fullest opportunity. Half a dozen persons simultaneously getting up and interrupting the business may be stopped.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—I would like to hear the point of order of this Minister first before a ruling is given, lest it may not be converted into a privilege motion at a later stage.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not giving a ruling on the point of order.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—There is only a motion. Just now, the Hon'ble Home Minister raised a point of order. We expected that he might state the facts of the point of order. But he simply stated that certain members staged a walk out for which he has raised point of order. He has further said that there is privilege motion which has nothing to do with the point of order. We want to know precisely what is the point

of order which the Hon'ble Home Minister wants to move in this House. Then we will express.

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—Does the Hon'ble Home Minister require a ruling? We want to know whether there is any real point of order or not.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—There is no substance in that point of order and it is belated Further point of order cannot be raised in a vaccum.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are not in a vaccum.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—There is no subject matter and there is no substance. It may be ruled out once for all.

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—May I add? What the Hon'ble Home Minister wants is not ruling ont he point of order. What he wants is permission to raise a privilege motion.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—This is incorrect. The Hon'b e Education Minister has no business to interfere.

Sri S. SHIVAPPA (Shravanabelagola).—Mr. Hon'ble Speaker, Sir, May I request you to order or direct the Hon'ble Home Minister to specifically state whether he has raised a point of order or a privilege motion. Some of the members do not know what is a point of order and what is a privilege motion and unneceesarily wasting the precious time of the House. I request the Speaker to direct them to be specific.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, there are two points: one is that the Hon'ble Minister for Home has mentioned that he has given notice of a Motion of Privilege, another is he said that there is a Point of Order. If I have understood it correctly, I have also given a similar notice of breach of Privilege. We all know that the conduct of...

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not permitting any speech.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA—Sir, Sri Lakkappa wanted to know whether a Point of Order could be raised in a vaccum. He said that there is no subject matter in it. Whether it amounts to a contempt of the House or breach of privilege is a matter for decision of the Chair.

† Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—Sir, may I draw your attention to rules 177 and 178 under chapter 20? It is stated that on the day when a particular Member wants to raise a Privilege Motion, he must give notice. Then the Chair has to permit him to raise that Privilege Motion. Without observing all these things, I think the notice is given. We do not know the contents of the Privilege Motion, we must first observe the procedure laid down in the rules 177 and 178. Otherwise, whatever we argue before this House, I think, will be of no use. I want to know whether the Chair has permitted the Hon'ble Minister for Home to move that Privilege Motion; whether the Chair has given its consent. If consent is given, I think, we are seized of the matter. What is the substance of the Privilege Motion and what is our conduct? How was it observed by Sri Garji Veerappa whether it was decent and whether it was palatable? If the Chair has given permission to move this Privilege Motion, let the contents of it be mentioned. Then we will be in a position to give our opinion. Before the consent of the Chair, whatever argument that will be advanced will be just like putting the horse

before the cart. I request the Hon'ble Chair to give consent and then let us see.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—We do not know whether the Hon'ble Chair has applied its mind to give its consent.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I suppose, all the Members are aware of the Rules as well as the articles of the Constitution. So far as the contents of the Rules and the articles of the Constitution are concerned, it is unnecessary for me to enlighten anybody. It may be necessary to remind them about the contents of the same. Hon'ble members have raised several Points of order asking whether it is a Point or Order or whether it is a Privilege Motion or whether it is a Motion at all; whether it is done properly or whether it has been raised in vacuum. A number of ideas were put forward. But, the basic fact does remain that on the day when His Excellency the Governor was addressing the joint session not only did some member stage a walk out, but something was also said at that time. It was a brief statement and that was read out and then a walk-out was staged. I do not think anybody can deny these things. If so, whether there has been any breach of the Rules of Procedence or of Articles of the Constitution? If there has been a breach, it may be raised as a Point of Order; or a Privilege Motion may be given notice of. The two concepts are different. A Point of Order is also a point drawing the attention of the Speaker or of the House and requesting the Chair to examine whether there is any breach of the Rules or not. If a Point of Order is raised, Members are aware that the Speaker has no choice: but to deal with it. I have to entertain it first and then rule it out if there is no substance in it. If there is any substance, we will have to see whether on the basis of the facts mentioned it amounts to a breach. If there is a breach, then it will be a question of breach of privilege of a peculiar type. That is how this question arises with regard to the breach of privilege. My attention was drawn to rules 177 and 178. Rule 177 says that if a Member wishes to raise a question of breach of Privilege, he cannot do it unless he gives in writing a notice to the Secretary, and if this is done, he is entitled to raise it. I mentioned that I had got some paper in my hand: one was a notice from Sri Ganji Veerappa, raising the question of a breach of privilege and the other was a communication from the Hon'ble Home Minister raising the question of interruption and walk-out during the Governor's Address and suggesting that a Committee should be appointed to go into the matter. But, wheather it would be proper to entertain it or not is a matter under consideration. I do feel that it does raise some question of importance. There are some questions on which there might be scope for discussion. Unless Members are prepared to convince me that there is no substance and that it should be disallwed *in limini*, I am not prepared to reject it. If I reject it then it cannot be entertained by the House. Therefore, the Speaker should not permit that to be raised on the floor of the House.

I think, matters of this type are not happening for the first time here. Such things have been happening elsewhere also. It will be necessary to apply our mind and come to a conclusion. Is there anybody who wants to say that it should be rejected *in limini* ?

†SRI S. M. KRISHNA.—We are not suggesting that the motion made by Sri Ganji Veerappa or the point raised by the Home Minister should be rejected. We wanted to be sure whether it is going to be recognised by way of a Point of Order or by way of a Motion of Breach of Privilege.

MR. SPEAKER.—Let the Hon'ble Member do not think that the Point of Order is upheld. That also requires study. I do not wish to give a Ruling without proper study. I would like to know the opinion of the House, study it a little and then I will deal with it on Monday.

†SRI S. M. KRISHNA.—But, both cannot be clubbed together. The Education Minister tried to amplify the statement made by the Home Minister. First of all, we want the Treasury Benches to be certain of what their stand is. You have also certain points which certainly need most serious consideration from all of us. We do not dispute that a 'one sentence statement' was made when His Excellency addressed the Joint Session of the House. More than one question is involved in this, Assembly was not in session. Legislative Council was not in session. It was a Joint Session of the Council and the Assembly and His Excellency the Governor addressed the Members of the Assembly as well as the Council. Now, the question is there is a breach of privilege. Breach of privilege of what ? Is it of the Council or of the Assembly ? We were not in session. All these complicated questions are bound to be raised. Well, we need some time to think over this matter, to apply our minds to this matter, inasmuch as the Home Minister also has to apply his mind a little more to this question and then this question may be taken up. In future also there might be occasions when such incidents might happen. After all this is not the first of its kind. I remember the Hon'ble Members of the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samithi used to stage walk outs when the Governor came to address the session. There is a precedent even in Delhi when the Joint Session of the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha was addressed by the President. Certain members did stage a walk out there. If it comes to that, we are certainly prepared to sit, discuss and evolve a method by which such situations could be avoided. After all, I blame the Government. We should understand why we staged a walk out and why we were not prepared to listen to what the Governor said. It is an unusual situation in the history of Mysore in the past 17 years. When does the Governor address the joint Session of the Legislature ? Usually, it is the Budget Session which has to be addressed by the Governor. I do not know what prompted the Government of Mysore to bring in the Governor at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER.—Should we go into the merits ?

SRI S. M. KRISHNA.—The chair drew the attention of the House to some of these questions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point is that whatever is said on the Floor of the House will be reported. There is no doubt about it. If I allow discussion, I will have to allow it on every aspect. If all the members agree with me and I would respectfully appeal to them to agree with me, this is a matter which has to be discussed after deep study and anything that is said now should not embarrass anybody at a later stage. Therefore I do not want to allow any member to get into its merits. All that I wanted to know was whether they wanted me to reject it *in limini*. I think it is worth considering. But I propose to postpone the consideration of this question. If I have to deal with the point of order or privilege, I have to deal with every point.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—How can there be a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have given time to the Hon'ble member and he has said whether there is a point of order or not. It arises when there is a breach of any decorum or of any article of the Constitution. I have been applying my mind to all such matters all these years, that is to say ever since I became the Speaker. I would rather reserve my ruling on the point of order. If I give my ruling now, I do not think the House would be at a greater advantage. On the other hand, it may lead to a little more complication. Therefore I propose to adjourn the consideration of all these matters to Monday.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—We have to apply our mind to two things.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the member wants I will give him copies of what has been mentioned.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The Hon'ble Speaker could reject the point of order raised.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot reject the point of order without Examining it. I have to deal with it.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—If it was raised on the occasion when it happened, it is all-right. It has not been raised then and there.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A point of order has to be raised at the earliest time.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—However we are asked to consider two aspects.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is a matter which is going to be considered in all its bearings before any ruling is given. If the members want to say something I am prepared to hear then I am not giving a ruling now. I should give a ruling at a later stage when I think it proper. If a Bill is involved and if a point of order or objection is raised relating to any Bill with which the House has to proceed forthwith, I would have given my ruling then and there. Now a little delay in giving a ruling on this question is not going to obstruct the proceedings of the House. After the discussion is over on Monday, I will see whether I should give a ruling immediately or I will let the House know then what I propose to do.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಇತಿಹಾಸದಲ್ಲೇ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಿತ್ರವಾದ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವನ್ನು ತಂದೊಡ್ಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಕ್ಕು ಭಾದ್ಯತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕ್ರಿಯಾರೋಪ ಇವುಗಳ ನಮ್ಮಿತ್ಯಕೆಯನ್ನು ಒಂದೇ ಪದದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ತಾವು ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ಏನೊಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರೋ ಅದು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಇತಿಹಾಸದಲ್ಲೇ ವಿಶೇಷವಾದ

ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧವಾದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟು ಅದರ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವ ಸಭೆಯು ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ನಿಲುವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಬಡಿಕೊತ್ತಿ, ಮೂಲೆಗೊತ್ತಿ, ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಭಂಗ ಅಥವಾ ಭನ್ನಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅಂಥವರಿಂದ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತದೆಯೆ ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಅಮೂಲಾಗ್ರವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾವ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನೆತ್ತಬೇಕು ? ಯಾವ ದಿವಸ, ಯಾವ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪವಾಗುವಾಗ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಆಗಲೇ ಎತ್ತಬೇಕು. ಅದು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಾದ ಒಂದು ತಿಂಗಳು ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷವಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪಗಳನ್ನೆತ್ತಬಹುದಾದರೆ, ನಾವು ಕೂಡ ಅಂತಹ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪಗಳನ್ನೆತ್ತಲು ನಮಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತ ಹೋದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಅನರ್ಥಕಾರಿ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಯಾವುದೋ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲ ಆದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನೆತ್ತುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಆಳವಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have adjourned it till Monday.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—We can discuss it on Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If it is the desire of the House that Monday too early it should be discussed on Wednesday also, I have no objection.

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It will go down in proceedings as Wednesday.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I raise a fresh point of order. It relates to the examination of the position of respective parties in the House

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is that a point of order ?

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—It is a point for consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will give him the fullest hearing. I want to know which rule is voilated.

2-00 P.M.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—With respect to the Party positions in the House—so far as the P.S.P. is concerned, it was the Party in Opposition and the Hon'ble Member Sri Sivappa was the Leader.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, it is not a point of order.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—He has to answer the question put by the Chair. The question was, what rule of the House was violated ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I must be left to me.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, he has not said what is his point of order.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—In brief, the only position is this : I want to know whether there is any Party to be called Opposition here and whether there can be a Leader of the Opposition-because the point is that there is no Opposition Party according to me.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, on a point of order. Is the Member in order to speak any thing he likes ?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, the Member is trying to question the ruling of the Speaker Is he in order ? It is a reflection on the Speaker. He has not raised a point of order at all. On the other hand, I am raising a point of order ?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, he is wasting the precious time of the House!

(Sri Ganji Veerappa was still on his legs)

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—I think Sri Veerappa will have the good sense to yield the floor to me when I raise a point of order. I am sure Mr. Speaker, you will certainly not entertain his point of order in all seriousness. He himself states that it is not a point of order. He says it is only a point for consideration.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Sir, the Chair was pleased to give an opportunity to me to explain my point. My friends should have the patience to listen to me.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—I would like to know, is it a point of order?

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—It is a point of order, because there is a breach of the procedure or practice that is followed in the House, namely whether a Party...

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I am raising a point of order, Sir. Under what rule of Procedure can a Member speak now? You ask us to follow the rules, and we have always followed the rules and obeyed the Chair. Now we do not know what is the point of order and the Chair is allowing him to speak—on what subject—is it on the agenda? How is he allowed to speak?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the position is this. If we are going to engage ourselves in such a conversation, we will not be able to do any business. Sri Ganji Veerappa said that he wanted to raise a point of order. In order to understand him I allowed him to Speak. I also wanted to know whether he was formulating his point of order. If it is not a point of order, but only a point for clarification, I will tell him that this is not the time. But I will have to decide whether or not it is a point of order. In this particular case, I did not want to pre-judge the matter. The member raised a point and was formulating it. At that time, I asked him 'you must tell me which rules is violated'. A point of order must relate to a breach of rule. That is why I am asking him: if he is raising a point of order, he should please tell me which rule he is having in mind. But before he finished, some Hon'ble Members on the opposite side raised another point of order. They should not do it. First I have to hear the member and as after hearing him, others can say it is not a point of order. My good friend is not able to cite any rule. Therefore, there is no merit in it, etc.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—It cannot be a point of order because it is not a violation of any rule. He has said something which does not amount to a point of order at all.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As a good lawyer, the Hon'ble Member should have patience to hear what is said on the other side before he comes to a conclusion.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—If it relates to enforcement of any rule, interpretation of the rule, then a point of order could be raised. He is trying to formulate a point and he is saying that previously there was

PSP and he does not know whether there is any Opposition Party. Does he seek to interpret any rule here ?

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Points of order are not meant for formulating any ideas. The Point of order should be precise. That is my point. Therefore I want the ruling from the Chair.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I only want to impress upon the House through the Chair Sir, that there is a breach of parliamentary practice with regard to the Party position. The recognised convention is that the Opposition Party should have sufficient strength in the House. I want to know whether such a Party in Opposition exists here. If not, the entire position of Parties here should change. That is why Sir, I want to suggest that in the light of parliamentary practice with regard to the Party position, it has to be examined and we should see whether there is any breach. I understand that there is no more the P.S.P. and that it has dissolved. The question is whether there is any other recognised Party in the Opposition having sufficient strength here I want to know whether such a thing has been formulated and whether there is any such Opposition Party here ?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Mr. Speaker, you are allowing him to go too far. Are you giving him any political platform here ? Are you going to allow him to discuss about political parties ? Are you going to allow us to discuss about the Congress Party here ? Is it the forum to discuss dissolution or formation of political parties I want to know. That is going too far. We cannot tolerate this. You are allowing the Member to speak about the formation and dissolution of political parties. What is the subject-matter ? You are allowing the member to go too far. Let him discuss these things on a political platform. This is not the time. You are giving too much independence to the Member to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not want comments when I am on my legs. Members must hear with patience and in silence and with respect for the House—not for me !

I want too things. Matters should not be unnecessarily complicated. The Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition was pleased to mention three times that I was allowing something. What does it mean ? He will not allow me to handle the situation. Patience prudence and restraint and courtesy towards one another are the very basis of democracy and parliamentary proceedings. The House is aware of the position very clearly—So far as I am concerned, I am concerned with the papers that have been placed before me. So far as the Party arrangements are concerned, the seating arrangements that have been made by me, prevail. These are covered by rules, conventions and decorum which govern parliamentary business. I have nothing as yet on my hand to know that there has been any change, except that some members—without any reflection of any kind whatsoever are found seats elsewhere—The Hon'ble Member Sri Parameswarappa who was sitting there seated I wanted to call him to put a supplementary and then I was found here. Found that there has been some change. So far as the Party is concerned, the position is well-known. Unless I have something in writing, I

(MR. SPEAKER)

cannot know the developments. If there is any request for rearrangement of seats.....

Sri R. M. PATIL.—It is the duty of the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Minister for Home wants to remind the Leader of the Opposition of his duties, may I invite him kindly to retire to my chambers so that the same may be done there over a cup of coffee.

So far as the point is concerned, I will hear members further tomorrow. Now we will take up the next item of Business in the Agenda.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—There is nothing to be hear dtomorrow. May I request the Hon'ble Chair to look to rule 212.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does he want me to revise my ruling ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, there is nothing to be heard. What about the point of order ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It will be heard tomorrow.

No-Confidence Motion against the Council of Ministers.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, I have given notice of a No-Confidence Motion. I request you, Sir, to give me permission to move the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the procedure to be followed ? Has the Hon'ble Member seen it ? Rule 153 reads :..... "leave to make the motion must be asked for after questions and before the list of business for the day is entered upon ; the member seeking for leave shall, before the commencement of the sitting of that day, give to the Secretary a written notice of the motion which he proposes to move." What is that No-Confidence Motion. The Hon'ble member may please read it.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The copy of my Motion is like this. "ಈಗಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸವಿಲ್ಲ....."

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನನಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ— "ಈಗಿನ ಮೈಸೂರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸವಿಲ್ಲ" ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿದೆ.

Now, may I know how many members are there in support of that motion ?

(*More than thirty Hon'ble Members rose.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—More than thirty members have stood up in support of the Motion.

(*Loud thumpings on the Tables of the Opposition*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, this is a small thing. I will try to fix sa early a time as possible. I will have to consult the Hon'ble Leader